

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

NARINDER J. SINGH

Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant,

v.

CASE NO. 07-13421

HON. LAWRENCE P. ZATKOFF

LORNE B. GOLD,

Defendant,

and

ADKISON, NEED & ALLEN, PLLC,

Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff.

OPINION AND ORDER

AT A SESSION of said Court, held in the
United States Courthouse, in the City of Port Huron, State of
Michigan, on the 7TH day of November, 2008

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE P. ZATKOFF
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Docket #20). In order to obtain reconsideration of a particular matter, the party bringing the motion for reconsideration must (1) demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties have been misled; and (2) demonstrate that "correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case." United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan Local Rule 7.1(g). See also *Graham ex rel. Estate of Graham v. County of Washtenaw*, 358 F.3d 377, 385 (6th Cir.6) 2004; *Aetna Cas. and Sur. Co. v Dow Chemical Co.*, 44 F.Supp.2d 865, 866 (E.D. Mich. 1999); *Kirkpatrick v. General Electric*, 969 F.Supp. 457, 459 (E.D. Mich. 1997). "[T]he court will not grant motions for rehearing

or reconsideration that merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication.” E.D. MICH. LR 7.1(g)(3).

In this case, Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration simply presents the same issues ruled upon by the Court in its September 25, 2008, Opinion and Order. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Motion is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Lawrence P. Zatkoff
LAWRENCE P. ZATKOFF
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: November 7, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of this Order was served upon the attorneys of record by electronic or U.S. mail on November 7, 2008.

s/Marie E. Verlinde
Case Manager
(810) 984-3290